

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2569/305143.1  
Application No.: 10/658,149  
Office Action Dated: March 17, 2008

PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116

## REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the final Office Action mailed March 17, 2008. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

### **Telephone Conversation With Examiner**

Examiner Paliwal is thanked for the telephone conversation conducted on May 27, 2008. Proposed claim amendments were discussed. No agreements were reached.

### **Present Status of Patent Application**

Claims 1, 2, 6-14, 17-27, and 29-34 are pending in the present application. Specifically, claims 9, 11, 13, 18-22, 24, 27, 29, and 30 are original unamended claims; claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 23, and 26 have been currently amended without introduction of new matter; claim 25 has been previously presented; claims 3-5, 15, 16, and 28 are canceled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer; and claims 31-34 are new claims that are being submitted without introduction of new matter. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102**

#### **Statement of the Rejection**

*Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Auerbach et al. (US 5,673,316), hereinafter Auerbach.*

#### **Response to the Rejection**

##### **Claim 1**

Amended claim 1 recites: “*one or more rules for ensuring the integrity of an address space that is used for execution of the software object, the one or more rules incorporating a list of acceptable and unacceptable modules, wherein the acceptable modules may be executed in the address space of the software object and the unacceptable modules are*”

unconditionally barred from being executed in the address space of the software object"  
(emphasis added).

Subject matter pertaining to the emphasized aspects is disclosed in various parts of Applicants' original specification. For example, in the Background section of the specification, Applicants have pointed out several shortcomings associated with existing art such as Auerbach. Specifically, in paragraph [0004], Applicants point out that: "*allowing rogue modules into the address space of the DRM system software would allow those rogue modules to access decrypted content in that address space, and to make unauthorized distribution or use of the content.*" The cited prior art of Auerbach acknowledges this problem in his col. 7, lines 15-18, and 50-67, wherein it is disclosed: "*without secure hardwares, the security of DFWM cannot be guaranteed. In many practical cases, we can achieve sufficient security using well-known software techniques (e.g., code-obscuring techniques well known to virus writers).*" As can be understood, Auerbach does not provide an adequate solution to overcome security issues associated with executing software in an insecure address space. In contrast, Applicants propose a method, as cited in claim 1, by which suitable protection may be provided (described in part in Applicants' paragraphs [0007] and [0031]) by a manifest that not only provides a list of modules that can be loaded into an address space, but further provides an explicit set of rules that unconditionally bar certain modules (whether encrypted or not) from being loaded into the address space. The cited prior art of Auerbach does not disclose such a manifest.

Consequently, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over Auerbach and hereby request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of the claim.

#### **Claims 2 and 6-10**

Applicants respectfully assert that claims 2 and 6-10 are allowable for several reasons. One amongst these several reasons arises from the fact that claims 2 and 6-10 are allowable as a matter of law arising from direct or indirect dependency on allowable independent claim 1. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of claims 2 and 6-10.

#### **Claims 3-5**

Applicants have opted to cancel claims 3-5 and respectfully submit that the rejection

of these claims has been rendered moot as a result of the cancellation.

**Claim 12**

Amended, claim 12 recites: “*a policy configured to preclude loading of a rogue module into an address space of a software object associated with the manifest.*” This aspect is disclosed in various portions of Applicants’ specification for example, in paragraphs [0003], [0004], [0031] and [0032]. The prior art of Auerbach does not disclose prevention of loading of rogue modules. Consequently, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 12 is allowable over Auerbach and hereby request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of the claim.

**Claims 13 and 14**

Applicants respectfully assert that claims 13 and 14 are allowable for at least the reason that these claims are dependent on allowable claim 12 and are consequently allowable as a matter of law arising from direct or indirect dependency. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of claims 13 and 14.

**Claims 15 and 16**

Applicants have opted to cancel claims 15 and 16 and respectfully submit that the rejection of these claims has been rendered moot as a result of the cancellation.

**Claim 17**

Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 17 is allowable, over Auerbach and hereby request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of the claim.

**Claims 18-21**

Applicants respectfully assert that claims 18-21 are allowable for at least the reason that these claims are dependent on allowable claim 17 and are consequently allowable as a matter of law arising from direct or indirect dependency. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of claims 18-21.

**Claim 23**

Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 23 is allowable, over Auerbach and hereby request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of the claim.

**Claims 24-29, 30**

Applicants respectfully assert that claims 24-29 and 30 are allowable for at least the reason that these claims are dependent on allowable claim 23 and are consequently allowable as a matter of law arising from direct or indirect dependency. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of claims 24-29 and 30.

### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

#### **Statement of the Rejection**

*Claims 11, 22 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Auerbach in view of Watanabe et al. (US 2002/018041 A1), hereinafter Watanabe.*

#### **Response to the Rejection**

##### **Claim 11**

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 11 for several reasons. However, Applicants opt not to elaborate upon these reasons at this time. Nonetheless, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 is allowable as a matter of law arising from dependency on allowable independent claim 1. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of claim 1.

##### **Claim 22**

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 22 for several reasons. However, Applicants opt not to elaborate upon these reasons at this time. Nonetheless, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 22 is allowable as a matter of law arising from dependency on allowable independent claim 17. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of claim 22.

##### **Claim 28**

Applicants have opted to cancel claim 28 and respectfully submit that the rejection of this claim has been rendered moot as a result of the cancellation.

### **Prior Art Made of Record**

The prior art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-2569/305143.1  
**Application No.:** 10/658,149  
**Office Action Dated:** March 17, 2008

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116**

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1, 2, 6-14, 17-27, and 29-34 are allowable. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date: June 17, 2008

**/Joseph F. Oriti/**  
Joseph F. Oriti  
Registration No. 47,835

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439